


**REMARKS**

This paper is presented in response to the non-final official action mailed December 5, 2008, in which a) claims 12-16 were pending, b) claims 12, 13, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,106,060 to Chapman, Jr. ("Chapman") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,280,982 to Moskowitz et al. ("Moskowitz"), and c) claims 14 and 15 were rejected as obvious over Chapman in view of Moskowitz and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0057143 to Lieberman et al. ("Lieberman").

By this amendment, claim 12 is amended to recite a method of conveying mailpieces using an electronic parcel compartment system, comprising, in part, selecting one of at least two different sized compartments in the parcel compartment system and relating the compartment size to a set of numbers of the recorded identification information. Support for the amendment to claim 12 may be found in the specification and claims as originally filed. For example, support may be found at least at page 8, line 21, Fig. 1, and claim 7 of the specification as originally filed. No new matter is added.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 12-16 as obvious over Chapman in view of one or more of Moskowitz and Lieberman. Each of claims 12-16 recites a method of conveying mailpieces comprising, in part, selecting one of at least two different sized compartments in the parcel compartment system and relating the compartment size to a set of numbers of the recorded identification information. The cited art fails to disclose or suggest selecting one of at least two different sized compartments in a parcel compartment system and relating the compartment size to a set of numbers of the recorded identification information.

Chapman discloses an electronic mail box including an entry slot 54 for receiving letters to be electronically transmitted. See Fig. 2 of Chapman reproduced below:



*Fig. 2*

The applicants respectfully disagree with the official action's interpretation of the Chapman device as an electronic parcel compartment system. See page 2 of the official action. The Chapman device converts physical documents (e.g., letters and other sheet-type documents) into electronic form for electronic transmission. See Chapman col. 1, lines 31-40. There are no storage compartments in the Chapman device. Rather, there is simply an entry slot 54 which receives the letter and transports the letter to a scanner. The scanner converts the physical document to electronic form. The physical document is then returned to the sender via the slot 54. See Chapman col. 4, lines 1-2; and col. 5, lines 5-6. Even if the location around the scanner was considered to be a storage compartment, Chapman still fails to disclose or suggest at least two different sized compartments. Moreover, one skilled in the art would not modify Chapman to include a storage compartment, let alone at

least two different sized storage compartments, as is recited by each of claims 12-16, because the primary purpose of Chapman is to convert documents to electronic form for electronic transmittal.

Moskowitz discloses a method for a fee address system. The method includes determining a fee for a particular delivery address based upon, for example, urgency, size, frequency, address, or person. See Moskowitz col. 2, lines 8-10. While Moskowitz teaches sending mail to a public box (see Moskowitz, col. 2, lines 38-39), there is no teaching in Moskowitz of selecting one of at least two differently sized compartments in an electronic parcel compartment system. In fact, Moskowitz fails to disclose or suggest an electronic parcel compartment system of any sort.

Lieberman discloses a method of handling communications including receiving and sorting physical communications. See Lieberman, abstract. However, Lieberman fails to disclose or suggest an electronic parcel compartment system of any sort, let alone selecting one of at least two different sized compartments in an electronic parcel compartment system.

Because Chapman, Moskowitz, and Lieberman all fail to disclose or suggest selecting one of at least two different sized compartments in an electronic parcel compartment system, none of claims 12-16 can be rendered obvious by any combination of Chapman, Moskowitz, and Lieberman. The applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12-16.

### **Conclusion**


For the foregoing reasons, entry of the foregoing amendments, consideration of the foregoing arguments, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, and allowance of claims 12-16 are respectfully requested.

Should the examiner wish to discuss the foregoing, or any matter of form, in an effort to advance this application towards, allowance, the examiner is urged to telephone the undersigned at the indicated number.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

March 4, 2009

By:   
Michael A. Chinlund  
Reg. No. 55,064  
Agent for Applicants

6300 Sears Tower  
233 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357  
(312) 474-6300